

Table of Contents

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Page</u>
CHAPTER 1: HOW TO USE GISST	1
What is it?	1
How is GISST different from other GIS tools?	1
Who can use GISST?	2
How does it work?	2
What are the benefits?	3
What are the drawbacks?	5
Who do I contact if I have further questions?	5
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND PRINCIPLES AND CONCEPTS	7
Introduction	7
NEPA	8
Cumulative Impacts Assessment	9
Watershed-Based Assessments	11
Decision Structures	12
GIS	13
Relationship to SAB Report	14
CHAPTER 3: CRITERIA DEVELOPMENT	20
Overall Structure	20
Area Criterion	22
Vulnerability Criteria	22
Impact Criteria	23
Criteria Groups	23
Water Quality	24
Ecological	24
Air Quality	25
Socioeconomic	25
Toxicity	25
CAFOs	26
Pollution Prevention	26
CHAPTER 4: APPLICATIONS	27
Introduction	27
Swine Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO) New Source Determination	28
IH-69 NAFTA International Corridor	36
NEPA Document Preparation and Review	69
LITERATURE CITED	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Relationship of the SAB framework ecological attributes to GISST criteria. (P) indicates the GISST criterion is provisional.	16
Table 2. Types of Data and GIS coverages and their sources.	40
Table 3. Sample GISST output (2 mile buffers) for Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Rancho, Blackjack and Lamar Units.	71

TABLE OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Surface Water Quantity criterion scores for Oklahoma.	30
Figure 2. Degree of Vulnerability for five subwatersheds in Oklahoma.	31
Figure 3. Degree of Impact for five subwatersheds in Oklahoma.	32
Figure 4. Degree of Impact for five subwatersheds in Oklahoma	33
Figure 5. Degree of Vulnerability for each swine feedlot (CAFO) facility in five subwatersheds in Oklahoma.	34
Figure 6. Degree of Impact for each swine feedlot (CAFO) facility in five subwatersheds in Oklahoma.	35
Figure 7. Proposed National Interstate 69 corridor.	37
Figure 8. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor	38
Figure 9. IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) corridor: initial GISST cumulative result overlay	50
Figure 10. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: population criterion	51
Figure 11. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: minority criterion	52
Figure 12. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: economically-stressed criterion	53
Figure 13. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: agriculture criterion	54
Figure 14. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: managed lands criterion	55
Figure 15. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: hazardous waste criterion	56
Figure 16. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: stream density criterion	57
Figure 17. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: impaired streams criterion	58
Figure 18. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs) and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: wetlands criterion	59
Figure 19. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs)	

and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: floodplain criterion	60
Figure 20. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs)	
and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: ozone nonattainment criterion	61
Figure 21. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs)	
and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: TEAP diversity criterion	63
Figure 22. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs)	
and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: TEAP rarity criterion	64
Figure 23. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs)	
and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: TEAP sustainability criterion	65
Figure 24. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs)	
and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: TEAP composite criterion	66
Figure 25. Comparison of a) IH69 Congressional study area (SIUs)	
and b) IH69 recommended reasonable corridor: cumulative results	67
Figure 26. Map of Aransas National Wildlife Refuge Lamar, Blackjack, and Rancho La Bahia units	74
Figure 27. Sample letter explaining GISST output	75

APPENDIX A: FINALIZED CRITERIA	A-1
Introduction	A-1
Water Quality	A-2
Surface Water Use	A-2
Water Quality (STORET Data)	A-3
Rainfall	A-4
Water Releases	A-5
Surface Water Quantity (Stream Density)	A-6
Distance to Surface Water	A-7
Ground Water Probability	A-8
Ground Water Quality	A-9
Unified Watershed Assessment (State Priority Data)	A-10
Clean Water Act 303(d) Segments (State Priority Data, TMDLS)	A-11
Average Stream Flow	A-12
Sole Source Aquifer	A-13
Floodplain	A-14
Aquifer/Geology Rating	A-15
Channelization	A-16
Individual Well Water	A-17
Septic Tank and Cesspool Use	A-18
TRI ¹ Reported Water Releases	A-19
Soil Permeability	A-20
Ecological	A-21
Agricultural Lands	A-21
Wetlands	A-22
Wildlife Habitat	A-23

Wildlife Habitat Quality (Land Use Data)	A-24
Habitat Fragmentation	A-25
Federally Listed Endangered and Threatened Species	A-26
State Listed Endangered and Threatened Species	A-27
Endangered Species Act Compliance	A-28
Ecologically Significant Stream Segments	A-29
TEAP Diversity	A-30
TEAP Rarity	A-31
TEAP Sustainability	A-32
TEAP Composite/Ecological Importance	A-34
Road Density	A-35
Watershed/Geographic Area	A-36
Density of Managed Lands	A-37
Air Quality	A-38
Air Quality	A-38
Ozone Nonattainment	A-39
TRI ¹ Reported Air Releases	A-40
Socioeconomic	A-41
Colonias	A-41
High School Education	A-42
Educational Achievement Ranking	A-43
Economic	A-44
Minority	A-45
Age	A-46
Children	A-48
Older Population	A-50
Pregnancy	A-51
Population Change	A-53
Population Density	A-54
Total Population	A-55
Houses Lacking Complete Plumbing	A-56
Telephone Communications	A-57
Ability to Speak English	A-58
Linguistic Isolation	A-59
Foreign Born	A-60
Cultural Resources	A-61
Toxicity	A-62
Toxicity Weighted TRI Water Releases	A-62
Toxicity Weighted TRI AIR Releases	A-63
Toxicity Weighted RCRA-BRS ² Data	A-64
Other Industries, Pollution Sources, or Protected Lands (Hazardous Waste)	A-65
CAFO	A-66

Livestock Population Density	A-66
Lagoon Loading Rate	A-67
Lagoon Treatment System Liner	A-68
Land Application Technology	A-69
Nitrogen Budget	A-70
Phosphorus Budget	A-71
Lagoon Storage Capacity	A-72
Well Head Protection	A-73
Employment in CAFO Industry	A-74
Odor	A-75
Transportation near CAFOs	A-76
Density of CAFOs	A-77
Proximity of CAFOs	A-78
 APPENDIX B: PROVISIONAL CRITERIA	B-1
Introduction	B-1
Criteria	B-2
Severity of Ozone Pollution	B-2
Employment	B-3
Age of Homes	B-5
RCRA Permitted Units	B-6
RCRA Hazardous Waste Disposal	B-7
Water Design Flow Data	B-8
Density of National Historical Places	B-9
Proximity of National Historical Places	B-10
Environmental Assessment	B-11
Pollution Prevention	B-12
Model Energy Code	B-13
Energy Efficient Office Equipment	B-15
Energy Efficient (EE) Appliances	B-16
Lighting System Upgrade	B-17
Million Solar Roofs Initiative	B-18
Federal Energy Management Program	B-19
Proximity of Managed Lands	B-20
Unregulated ¹ CAFO ² Facilities	B-21
Presence of Aquifer	B-22
Landscape Texture	B-23
Landscape Aggregation	B-24
Patch Area	B-25
 APPENDIX C: GIS PROGRAMMING	C-1
Introduction	C-1

Figure E-12. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: stream density criterion	E-12
Figure E-13. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: impaired streams criterion	E-13
Figure E-14. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: wetlands criterion	E-14
Figure E-15. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: floodplain criterion	E-15
Figure E-16. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: ozone nonattainment criterion	E-16
Figure E-17. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: TEAP diversity criterion	E-17
Figure E-18. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: TEAP rarity criterion	E-18
Figure E-19. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: TEAP sustainability criterion	E-19
Figure E-20. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: TEAP composite criterion	E-20
Figure E-21. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: final cumulative results.	E-21
Figure E-22. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: wildlife habitat criterion	E-22
Figure E-23. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: Federally-listed species criterion	E-23
Figure E-24. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: State listed species criterion	E-24
Figure E-25. IH69 Segment (SIU) 3: ecologically significant streams criterion	E-25

Citation:

Osowski, S. L., G. D., Carney, J. D. Swick, J. A. Danielson, D. A. Parrish, and D. Lueckenhoff, 2005. US EPA Region 6 GIS Screening Tool (GISST) User's Manual. Version 1.1. US Environmental Protection Agency Region 6. Dallas, TX.